

REMARKS

Support for the amendment of claim 1 may be found at page 5, lines 24-27 and in Figures 3-6 and their descriptions. Claim 16 has been cancelled to eliminate concerns about the meaning of “free radical quencher”. Fresh complete copies are enclosed wherewith in response to the Examiner’s request for complete copies of the patent references identified in the prior IDS submission. Enclosed herewith is a terminal disclaimer over copending Application No. 10/039,441 and 10/046,024. Finally, Applicant hereby affirms the election of the invention of Group I and the species as specified in claims 6, 8, 9, and 14, without traverse. The Examiner is requested to reconsider the non-elected species upon allowance of any generic claims.

Claims 1-6, 8, 9, and 11-23 stand rejected as obvious over Ylitalo et al. The present amendment serves to clarify the distinction between the reference and the claimed invention. The presently amended claims require the image receiving layers (IRLs) that constitute the base of the cells to remain stiff at the fusion temperature. This permits the cell walls to desirably flow on top of the imaged surface rather than undesirably flowing down into the image receiving layer cell base if that layer becomes too soft. The embossed cells of the cited reference are readily distinguished from the invention and in a way such that the reference arrangement could not provide the fusion initiated protective layer provided by the invention.

The present invention provides hydrophobic cell walls and an image receiving base. If the walls are bonded to a hydrophilic layer, then the continuous IRL serves as the cell base. On the other hand, if the walls are bonded to a hydrophobic layer, then the cells contain the IRL on top of the continuous hydrophobic base. This arrangement is readily distinguished from the embossed surface of the reference. Such an embossed surface would have walls and a base of common material. This would undesirably enable the walls to slip down into the melting base material and not provide the desired overcoat. The desired overcoat by fusion would not be achieved.

The claimed ink jet media is particularly adapted to provide improved image quality while at the same time providing ready fusion of the cell walls into a protective layer for the inked areas of the receiver layer. The Examiner argues that it would be obvious to include the UV absorbers in the layers of the reference. Applicant disagrees. The present invention contemplates fusing the walls to form a protective overcoat. Having UV absorbers in the overcoat would then provide enhanced protection for the underlying image. But, in contrast, the reference does not contemplate converting the wall material into

an overcoat layer so the presence of a UV absorber would not be beneficial to any comparable extent.

The cited reference neither teaches, discloses nor suggests fusing the hydrophobic cell network to form a protective layer nor providing such a network that is capable of being so fused. Where heat is discussed by the reference, it is suggested that the embossing or compressing take place at a temperature of 100-200°C (pages 16-17). Thus, there is no suggestion to employ hydrophobic polymers that are fusible at a temperature of below 100°C.

The remaining claims depend from claim 1 and are likewise patentably distinguishable from the art for the reasons stated. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the outstanding rejection and to pass this application to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 25,518

Arthur E. Kluegel/dlm
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: (585) 477-2625
Facsimile: (585) 477-1148